

## **R E M A R K S**

A Request for Continued Examination is filed with this response to remove the finality of the pending Office Action and to obtain entry of the claim amendments indicated above.

Claims 20-26 are now in this application, since new claims 25 and 26 have now been added. Support for the limitations recited in the new claims is found at page 10, lines 13-22 of the specification. Claims 20 and 24 remain the only independent claims. No new matter is believed added by this amendment. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 20-24 stand rejected as anticipated by the Burge reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,638). It is believed that, at least as now amended, these claims are allowable over Burge.

At the outset, applicant wishes to point out significant differences between Burge's system and the subject matter of the present application. In Burge's system, a host computer<sup>1</sup> tracks on-line activity initiated by a shopper operating a computer 80 that is in communication with the host computer, and as a result, information displays downloaded via the network to the shopper's computer are selected to reflect the shopper's preferences as indicated by the shopper's online activity. By contrast, according to the present application, the user's own computing device (corresponding, for example, to the shopper's computer in Burge) tracks the on-line activity initiated from the user's computing device to cause updating of user preferences indicated by the browser operating on the user's computing device. Thus, in the present invention, the device which tracks the on-line activity is different from Burge's system, and the information that is customized to reflect the detected on-line activity is also different from Burge's system.

Applicant will now turn to specific claim language that distinguishes the claims from the Burge reference.

Claim 20, as now presented, is directed to a "computing device operable by a user to interact with network sites over a network interface". The computing device of claim 20 includes "a processor" and "a communication port coupled to said processor and adapted to

---

<sup>1</sup> I.e., shopping manager 84--see column 6, lines 49-67 and column 4, lines 38-42.

communicate with a plurality of network sites over said network interface”. The computing device of claim 20 further includes “a storage device coupled to said processor”. The storage device stores (1) “browser software adapted to control said processor to download and display information from said plurality of network sites”, (2) “characteristic information associated with each of a plurality of network sites”, (3) “preference information including a ranking of preferred ones of said plurality of network sites as measured by said characteristic information for automatically configuring user preferences indicated by said browser software”, and (4) “instructions adapted to be executed by said processor”.

The characteristic information is specified in claim 20 as “including information identifying the duration and frequency of visits to each of said plurality of network sites”. The “instructions” indicated at (4) above implement the following functionality:

“detect[ing] network activity of said user when said user operates said browser software to interact with said plurality of network sites”;

“updat[ing] said characteristic information based on said detected network activity”;

updat[ing] said preference information based on said updated characteristic information to automatically reconfigure user preferences indicated by said browser software”; and

“repeatedly detect[ing] and updat[ing] as said user operates said computing device such that said user preferences indicated by said browser software automatically reflect usage patterns of said user”.

Thus, one limitation of claim 20 that is not present in Burge’s system is software instructions which operate at a computer with a browser to repeatedly detect network activity and update character and preference information stored in the computer so that the user preferences indicated by the browser automatically reflect the user’s patterns of usage.

Moreover, Burge’s system also lacks “characteristic information” stored at the computer that runs the browser, where the characteristic information includes information that identifies duration and frequency of website visits.

Still further, Burge’s system does not include “preference information” stored at the computer that runs the browser, where the preference information ranks websites according to the characteristic information referred to above.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 20 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 21-23, 25 and 26 are dependent on claim 20 and are submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 20. Also, the above remarks concerning claim 20 are generally applicable to independent method claim 24, which is also believed to be allowable over the Burge reference.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,



October 17, 2005  
Date

---

Nathaniel Levin  
Registration No. 34,860  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Five Elm Street  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-3460